

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

Claims 11-19 are pending in the application. Claims 11, 18 and 19 have been amended. Claims 16 and 17 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. The amended claims are based on the specification. Claim 11-15, 18 and 19 are pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims

35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Friedman (U.S. Patent No. 4,715,955). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have amended claims 11 and 18. Claims 16 and 17 have been canceled

Amended claims 11 and 18 recite “the first and second transverse filtrate channel portions are configured to form acute angles that comes together to provide a structural arrangement with an upper surface of the end plate, wherein the source of fluid is configured to flow out of a single outlet port of the end plate.” The structure of amended claims 11 and 18 provide the filtration device where the first and second transverse filtrate channel portions are configured to form acute angles that come together to provide a structural arrangement where the source of fluid flows simply through a single outlet port. (Specification page 14, lines 5-14). Also, for

claim 18 the declining acute angles of the first and second transverse portions comes together to allow fluid to flow out easily through a hole of a single outlet port the filtration device.

Friedman provides “a filtration apparatus including a filtration module having an axially stacked plurality of filter membrane sheets with the module defining a stack of fluid flow chambers having multi-edged perimeters and disposed on opposite sides of and substantially co-extensive with each membrane sheet. The perimeters of the membrane sheets and the chambers are sealed such that fluid flow between adjacent chambers must pass through a membrane sheet straddled thereby. Also defined by the module are a plurality of feed passages communicating with alternating ones of the chambers adjacent first axially aligned edges thereof, a plurality of retentate passages communicating with the alternating chambers adjacent to second axially aligned edges thereof opposite to the first edges, and a plurality of filtrate passage means communicating with other ones of the chambers between the alternating ones thereof and with the filtrate passage means entering the other chambers adjacent to either the first or second aligned edges.” (Column 1, lines 34-55).

Also, as the Examiner stated “As shown in FIG. 4, the transverse filtrate channel portions 52, 54 from acute angles with an upper surface 55 of the end plate 13. Outer ends of the longitudinal filtrate channel portions 51, 53 terminate, respectively, with outlet ports 56, 57 in the sidewall 37 of the end plate 13.” (Column 4, lines 19-24).” (Office action, page 2, lines 23-26). However, Friedman does not suggest, anticipate or disclose that it provides a filtration device where the first and

second transverse filtrate channel portions are configured to form acute angles that come together to provide a structural arrangement where the source of fluid flows out simply through a single outlet port. Also, Friedman does not have declining acute angles of the first and second transverse portions that allows fluid to flow out easily through a hole of the filtration device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 18 are allowable. Claims 14, 15, and 19, which depend from independent claims 11 and 18, are allowable because independent claims 11 and 18 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allows claims 11 and 14-19.

35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Latour et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,102) and/or Friedman (U.S. Patent No. 4,715,955). Applicants have amended claims 11 and 18. Claims 16 and 17 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In light of the arguments discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent claims 11 and 18 are patentable over the reference cited by the Examiner.

Since the independent claims 11 and 18 are patentable because they overcome the Examiner's rejections to Friedman, as discussed above, the amended independent claims 11 and 18 and dependent claims 12-15 and 19 overcome the Examiner's rejections also based on Latour et al. because Latour et al. does not overcome the arguments discussed above. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the

rejection of claims 11-15, 18 and 19 as amended.

Conclusion

Claims 11-15, 18 and 19 are patentable. Therefore, in view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If for any reason, however, the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are in allowable form and earnestly solicit the allowance of the claims 11-15, 18 and 19.

Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences Corp.

By: /Dwayne L. Bentley/
Dwayne L. Bentley
Reg. No.: 45,947
Attorney for Applicants

GE Healthcare Bio-Sciences Corp.
800 Centennial Avenue
P. O. Box 1327
Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1327

Tel: (732) 457-8678
Fax: (732) 457-8463

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being uploaded to the United States Patent and Trademark Office using the Electronic Filing System on March 13, 2009.

Signature: /Melissa Leck/

Name: Melissa Leck